

ACM/ed
3
balancing circuit being responsive to said mirroring circuitry and operable to control current flow through the sourcing circuitry over a prescribed range.

REMARKS

By the present amendment, claims 1, 12 & 19 have been amended to address perceived indefiniteness and to more clearly define the subject matter of the present invention. For example, claim 1 has been amended to provide literal antecedence for "mirroring circuitry" that is recited elsewhere in the claim and in various claims dependent ultimately from claim 1.

The indication of allowability as to claims 4, 5, 15 and 16 is noted with appreciation. The redrafting of these claims has been held in abeyance pending final resolution as to the patentability of the remaining claims in view of the accompanying amendments and remarks.

Claims 1-3, 6-14 and 17-20 stand rejected as being anticipated (claims 1, 6, 11, 12 & 19) or obvious (claims 2 & 13) in view of a circuit disclosure entitled "Motorola Linear/Interface Devices". While independent claims 1, 12 and 19 have been amended to more clearly define the control of current through the device, the rejection of these claims is respectfully traversed.

As understood from the Motorola circuit diagram, the disclosed circuit does not permit for the control of current over a range of currents through a PNP bipolar junction transistor, such as transistor 136 depicted in Fig. 3 of the present application. Instead, the Motorola circuit appears to represent a Class A output stage that is capable of sourcing whatever value of quiescent current that flows through transistor Q15. Since the input stage cannot influence the current flow in transistor Q15, the maximum current that can be sourced is the same as that which flows through transistor Q15, even when the output stage is sinking current.

In contrast, in the circuit of the present invention, the balancing circuit 30 (Fig. 1) /144 (Fig. 3) and mirroring circuit 42 (Fig. 1) /152 (Fig. 3) allow for

current flow through the PNP junction transistor to be controlled such that, when the output sources a large current, the PNP current can also be large. When the input sinks current, the PNP is "off." When the output is neither sinking nor sourcing, the current in the PNP can be set at a variable, controlled level. This aspect of operation is set forth in the claims, for example, in claim 1, which recites in pertinent part:

"a current balancing circuit responsive to said mirroring circuitry and coupled a control current flow through said sourcing circuitry over a prescribed range"

No similar structure or manner of operation is apparent from the Motorola circuit.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, reconsideration and withdrawal of the claim rejection based upon the Motorola reference is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul C. Hashim
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 31,618

Texas Instruments Incorporated
P.O. Box 655474, MS 219
Dallas, TX 75265
(214) 995-1185